

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the foregoing claim amendments.

Section 102 Rejections

Boulter Reference

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 20-25, and 27 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Boulter (US Patent No. 6,093,312). Claim 1 has been amended and recites "a treated water source integral with the unit, said treated water source comprising a reverse osmosis water treatment system including a flexible reservoir in which water treated by said reverse osmosis water treatment system is stored". Boulter does not show a treated water system that is integral with the unit, nor does it show a flexible reservoir in which RO treated water is stored. Boulter shows a traditional system in which a separate RO treatment system supplies other equipment, and does not show the RO treated water being stored in a flexible reservoir. Its RO water is stored outside of an inner bladder.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, and all its dependent claims, should be allowed over the Boulter reference.

With respect to independent Claim 20, and its dependent claims, Boulter does not show a water treatment system integral with a water using unit. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Indeed, "Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim . . . [and] [t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 E2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As mentioned above, Boulter shows a separate water treatment system

supplying other equipment. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the entire system of Boulter is an integrated system (which it is not), it does not show a separate remote unit as required in Claim 20.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 20, and all its dependent claims, should be allowed over the Boulter reference.

Furthermore, Claims 4, 10, 17, and 27 have been amended to make clear that the reservoir is in cooling proximity to the cooling source, which was the intent of the original claims. This feature is nowhere found or suggested in Boulter.

Blades Reference

Claims 1-14, 20-25, and 27 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Blades (US Patent No. 5,536,411). As discussed above, Claim 1 recites an integral water treatment system and a flexible reservoir. Blades' RO system is the traditional separate kind, which is used to supply a tank. The water is then heated and used by an ice-rink resurfacing machine. There is plainly no integration of the two (indeed, the resurfacing machine is a moving unit completely separate from the RO unit). Moreover, no flexible reservoir is taught.

With respect to Claim 20, Blades again does not show a water using unit integrated with a treated water source. Blades shows only an RO system that supplies a tank. Water is then heated for use by the resurfacing machine. Clearly there is no integration with a water-using unit. Moreover, Claim 25 recites that the host system is an ice making system. No such host system is shown in Blades.

Moreover, as discussed above, Claims 4, 10, and 27 have been amended to make clear that the reservoir is in cooling proximity to the cooling source, which was the intent of the original claims. This feature is nowhere found or suggested in Blades (in fact, Blades shows heating).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 20, and all their dependent claims, should be allowed over the Blades reference.

Credle Reference

Claims 1 and 15-19 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Credle (US Patent No. 5,992,685). Credle shows nothing about an integral treated water source, and in particular nothing related to a flexible reservoir that stores treated water. Its disposable package is for storing concentrate, not water. Clearly the Claims should be allowed over the Credle reference.

Section 103 Rejections

Boulter Reference

Claim 13 was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious in view of Boulter. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is allowable in light of, among other things, the amendment to Claim 1.

Boulter + Credle References

Claims 26 and 28-30 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Boulter in view of Credle. Nothing in these references suggests that they be combined, and thus their combination is improper. Moreover, even when combined, the claimed invention is not found. As discussed above, Boulter does not teach a water-using unit integrated with a treated water source, and Credle does not teach anything about a treated water source. Thus, they cannot together add up to an integrated unit supplying a separate unit. And, even if, *arguendo*, one viewed Boulter as showing an integrated system, it does not suggest supplying anything else. Therefore, the combination is improper.

Also, with respect to Claims 28 and 29, the host system is a beverage dispenser, and the remote system is an ice maker. Clearly this is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

The law and guidance is very clear that the patent application cannot be used as a roadmap to piece together bits of prior art in an attempt to make an obviousness rejection.

"The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the worker in the art, without the benefit of appellant's specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device." *Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Mfg. Co.*, 223 USPQ 351, 353 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984). There is no suggestion or motivation here to combine the cited references, and thus it is respectfully requested that the obviousness rejection of Claims 26 and 28-30 be withdrawn.


New Claims 31

New Claim 31 is original Claim 4 written in independent form, with an amendment as in claim 4 to make clear the cooling relationship of the cooling source to the reservoir. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references teaches the claimed invention, and allowance is requested.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all outstanding claims. If there are any questions concerning this amendment, please call Dennis Braswell at the telephone number set forth below.

Please direct all correspondence to:
Dennis Braswell
105 Soost Court
Mobile, Alabama 36608
Telephone (251) 414-2969.

May 13, 2003
Date


Dennis Braswell
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,831